

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. Claims 1-18 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 10, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 4). The Examiner states that claims 4, 10, and 16 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to practice the invention. The Examiner further states that the specification does not specifically disclose how to analyze the file to determine irresolvable elements and it also fails to disclose the method used to resolve the irresolvable elements.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicants' specification discloses that a "the converted file is analyzed (54) for printer irresolvable elements," (page 4, lines 21-22) and the "resolver 30 analyzes (54) the file searching for elements of the file irresolvable by output device 8. Irresolvable elements include fonts, images, patterns, and other files not resident on output device 8. Resolver 30 resolves 56 all elements irresolvable by output device 8." (Page 4, lines 29 - page 5, line 2).

An applicant for patent is not required to show every detail in order to provide enablement. The specification need not disclose what is well known in the art. The enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is satisfied if the application contains a description that enables one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Methods for analyzing files to determine elements that are irresolvable by a printer and methods used to resolve the printer irresolvable elements are well known in the printer art. These steps are commonly taken by printer drivers installed on computers. Since analyzing files for irresolvable elements irresolvable by a printer and resolving the irresolvable elements are well known in

the art, it is not necessary to show the details of those actions in the specification to enable Applicants' claims 4, 10, and 16.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. (Examiner's Action, page 3, ¶ 5). The Examiner states that claims 3, 9, and 15 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to practice the invention. The Examiner further states that the specification does not specifically disclose how to determine the file type when analyzing the contents of the file.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicants' specification discloses that "the file type of the file is discovered by examiner 38 analyzing the contents of the file to discover the file type." (Page 4, lines 10-11).

An applicant for patent is not required to show every detail in order to provide enablement. The specification need not disclose what is well known in the art. The enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is satisfied if the application contains a description that enables one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Methods for determining the file type of a file by analyzing the contents of the file are well known in the printer art. Many file types include header information that indicates the type of file. Applications may use this header information to discover the file type of the file. This is one example, which is well established practice in the art and quite well known. Since determining the file type of a file by analyzing the contents of the file is well known in the art, it is not necessary to show the details of those methods in the specification to enable Applicants' claims 3, 9, and 15.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Boswell, U.S. Patent No. 5,559,933. (Examiner's Action, page 3, ¶ 7).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Boswell discloses a distributed enterprise print controller for coordinating the distribution of print files across multiple computer systems to attached printers for printing (Boswell, Abstract). Arriving print files 272 are distributed to printers based on various criteria. The files may be received over a network or be local to a PC (Col. 18, line 20-25). Boswell does not disclose the path of the file is received, but rather that the print files 272 themselves are received by the system. Additionally, it would not be inherent that the paths of the files be received, as the paths are not necessary when the print files 272 are present.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, and 13 include wording that a path of the file is received. Boswell does not disclose receiving a file path or any structure for doing so.

In addition, Boswell discloses that files may be sent to a print server, but Boswell does not disclose a write to the server being initiated responsive to a print ready file type. The files are instead sent to the print server responsive to the file mask processing of the files.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, and 13 include wording that a write of the file to the server is initiated responsive to a print ready file type. Boswell does not disclose taking such action responsive to a print ready file type.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boswell in view of Roberts, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,650,431. (Examiner's Action, page 5, ¶ 9).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boswell in view of Crandall, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,963,641. (Examiner's Action, page 6, ¶ 10).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 7, and 13 being allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
James S. Boyce

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 10/28/2004
(719) 260-7900